

A N
A P P E N D I X

To the LIFE of the
Right Rev^d Father in God

S E T H

Lord B I S H O P of *Salisbury* ;

Written by

Dr. *WALTER POPE*, F.R.S.

I N A

L E T T E R
to the *AUTHOR*.

L O N D O N :

Printed for *E. Whitlock*, near *Stationers
Hall*, 1697.

APPENDIX

SETH

DEWALTER POST

LETTER

TO THE NEW YORK

DOWN

*An APPENDIX to the
Life of the Right Reverend
Father in God SETH,
Lord Bishop of Salisbury.*

SIR,

I Am wonderfully surpris'd at your History of the Life of ^{*Life of*} Bishop WARD, considering too ^{*Bishop*} ^{*Ward.*} that you inform the World, ^{*p. 193.*} that *Your Intellectuals are as good now as ever they were.*

Pray be pleas'd to recollect, that a Writer of such an History should endeavour at a concise, easie decent Stile, expressing a Reverence for the Memory of the Person whose Life he describes. The Relations ought to be contriv'd for instruction, and chiefly set as Patterns of Imitation. *Minute* matters ought to be chosen with Discretion, and *common* Passages just

A 2 toucht

tought and *hinted* at. Whereas your Narration is drest up in a Comical and Bantering Stile, full of dry Scraps of Latin, Puns, Proverbs, senseless Digressions, long tedious unedifying Tales, and not without an insipid **Bawdy* Jest, and an impious † *Ridicule* of the Morality of the Fourth Commandment.

pag. 165.
pag. 26.

I protest I cannot see one instructing Page in the whole History, or that tends that way, unless it is a *wild* and whimsical Account of the Bishop's Charity and Hospitality.

Would a Man of tolerable Judgment commend a Reverend Prelate for a *good Jockey*, and in the History of his Life describe his *Mare*, with Dr. *Weeks's Nag*, and Dr. *Pope's* own Nag, with an account of the Nag's unfortunate Life and Death, though the joynt Endeavours of the best Farriers were used for his recovery? What Exposition will the ill-natur'd World make, when the Author says, by way of Commendation, that his Bishop was never destitute of Friends of the *fair Sex*? and that he * *provided* Husbands for his Nieces, and *preferr'd* them? You injudicially ridicule him, when you tell the World,

pag. 83.
pag. 6.

pag. 179.

he

he was cheated and laughed at by *Surgeons and Apothecaries*; you make sport with his * *Decay of Memory*, and pag. 181. introduce into this History a pitiful Criticism upon *Ovid de Tristibus* mira- pag. 151. culously redeemed from the Fire in *Lombard-street*. With a great deal of Solemnity you positively affirm that *Dr. Barrow* made use of a Tinder-Box, p. 145, 146 and had no Buttons upon his Collar; for that you knew the whole matter, because you were his Bedfellow. How shrewdly do you argue, that if *Dr. Barrow* was born in *February*, it pag. 129. could not be in *October*? Your Discourse of sore Eyes and couching Cataracts; your *Advertisement* that * *Mrs. Mary Turbervile* is a good Ocu- pag. 108. list; and that you had a disbanded Soldier for your *Bed-Maker* at * *Wad-* pag. 113. *ham-Colledg, &c.* make such a mixture of Vanity, gossiping and quibbling Folly, that I cannot chuse but recollect the just Character which *Mr. Anthony Wood* gives of your Worship to this effect, viz. 'That *Dr. Pope* has 'spent much time in observing the 'Motions and Appearances of the 'Heavens, which is hoped will be 'published by him hereafter, instead

' of those *vain and trivial* things, as
' he hath hitherto done, *Athen. Oxon.*
vol. II. p. 821. Thus that plain and
impartial Historian.

You have fill'd your History with
such Remarks, as if you had design'd
to imitate the Failings of *Sorbiere*,
and had a mind that a better-Pen
should record your Name by corre-
cting your Errors. That I may ex-
plain my meaning, I will follow your
Method, and tell a Story. After Ser-
mon, once upon a time, I accosted an
ingenious Friend that was plodding
homewards after this manner; *Prithee*
how didst like the facetious old Doctor
to day? My Friend fetch'd a deep
Sigh, and replied in a melancholy
note, *Sir, very pert and very dull; the*
forriest Man that ever stood up to the
Arm-pits in Wainscot; he has methodi-
sed and collected into a Sermon all the
impertinent Quibbles and Sayings of the
worst Preachers, and I really believe he
has feloniously taken good part of what
Dr. Eachard exposed in his Contempt
of the Clergie.

You have borrowed your Method,
Transitions, and the Arguments of
your Chapters from the ridiculing
History

History of *Don Quixote*. As thus, in the end of your *Third, Fourth, Seventh, Eighth, Ninth, Seventeenth, Eighteenth, Nineteenth, and Twentieth Chapters* of your Book, you conclude to this effect, *What befel him afterwards during his stay at Cambridge shall be the Subject of the next Chapter. And how Mr. Ward behaved himself at Oxford, and what befel him there, will be the Subject of the ensuing Chapters.*

The *Arguments* of several Chapters are in these Words, (*viz.*) *A Continuation of the precedent matter; The same matter continued; The Controversie concerning Caps and Hoods; Of what happened to Dr. Ward at Oxford, concerning my self; A Digression containing some Criticisms; Of the Bishop's Sickness and Death.*

In the History of *Don Quixote* it runs thus; *He began to speak what shall be heard or seen by him that shall hear or read the next Chapter. It shall be so, (quoth Don Quixote) and thus lifting up his Eyes, he saw that which shall be recounted in the Chapter following, Chap. 7. Lib. 3. Part. I. Of what happened to Don Quixote going to Barcelona. (Chap. 60. Part II.) What*

besel Don Quixote going to see his Mistress Dulcinea del Toboso. (Chap 8. Part II.) wherein is prosecuted the former Narration of our Knight's Misfortunes. (Chap. 5. Lib. 1.) wherein is recounted, prosecuted and finished the Novel of the curious Impertinent. (Chap. 5,6,7. Lib. 4.) Wherein the Canon continueth his Discourse of Books of Chivalry. (Chap. 21. Lib. 4.) A Digression in the Rehearsal of the despairing Verses of the dead Shepherd. (Chap. 6. Lib. 3.) How Don Quixote fell sick, of the Will he made, and of his Death.

I firmly believe, no Man will be punish'd in the next World for being dull or impertinent; but for Malice and Falshood there will be a severe account. I shall not trouble my self to examin the truth of the matters of fact through your *whole History*. I will only shew you your Mistakes in
pag. 171. reference to one * *Anthony à Wood*, as you are pleased to phrase it; a Name that is mention'd with Honour in places, where even that of Bishop *Ward's* is unknown.

ibid. You have accused him as an *Inventer of Calumnies*: But that does not appear in the Characters of *Dr. Ward* or *Dr. Pope*.

Dr. Pope. And if you will venture to name any other, I dare appeal to the World (but excepting those and their Relations who have suffered by his plain dealing Pen) whither his Pictures have not near resemblances with the *Originals*.

‘ *Dr. Ward*, you say, in the times *pag. 172.*
 ‘ of the Usurpation lived *peaceably* at
 ‘ *Oxford*, but was far from any Com-
 ‘ *pliance*. Whereas the Committee
 for the Reformation of that Univer-
 sity made him Astronomy-Professor;
 and in *October 1649*. he took the *En-*
gagement to be faithful to the Com-
 monwealth of *England*, as it was then
 established without a King or House of
 Lords, *Athenæ Oxon. p. 627. Vol. II.*
 as it appear’d in the Registry belong-
 ing to the Committee for the Re-
 formation of that University, and as
 the Clerk belonging to that Com-
 mittee inform’d *Mr. Wood* and others
 many Years since. *Vindication of the*
Oxford Historiographer, &c. p. 27.

You have added further, ‘ That
 ‘ he went not to his Grave unpunish’d,
 ‘ for he liv’d to see his Book censur’d
 ‘ and burnt, himself expell’d the Uni-
 ‘ *versity*,

pag. 174. ' verſity, obliged to recant, and give
 ' Security not to offend any more in
 ' that kind. And this he underwent
 for writing too lavishly concerning a
 Great Man, &c.

I will not question the *Legality* of
 that Sentence, I ſhall content my
 ſelf to tell you that a Writer may
 relate a matter of fact upon an e-
 vidence ſufficient for *History*, which
 cannot amount to a Juſtification in a
 Court of Law. There may be ma-
 ny things true in your Account of
 the Life of Biſhop *Ward*; but I
 believe you can hardly bring Two
 Witneſſes that will ſwear to the truth
 of every particular Paragraph. If the
 Sentence *was* legal, and if a *Perſon*
deceas'd many years ago can, properly
ſpeaking, ſuffer by a Reflection in Hiſto-
ry, and the Heir bring an Action of
Defamation for it; *History* muſt be
 laid aſide; all Enquiries into the
 Characters of Great Men in the Ages
 before us, and all controversial Diſ-
 courſes, where the Opinions, Con-
 duct, and Behaviour of our Fore-Fa-
 thers of neceſſity muſt be examined.
 The Virtues of Men ought to be
 display'd,

display'd, and their Vices expos'd for our instruction. And if the Historian is mistaken, his Punishment is to be despis'd and neglected for a bad Writer.

Postulatur novo ac tunc primum audito Crimine (says Tacitus of Crematius Cordus) *quod editis Annalibus, laudatoque M. Bruto C. Cassium Romanorum ultimum dixisset.* He goes on a little further, *Libros per adiles cremandos censere Patres, sed manserunt occultati & editi.* Quo magis socordiam eorum irridere libet qui presenti potentiâ credunt extingui posse sequentis ævi Memoriam; nam contra, punitis ingeniis gliscit autoritas, &c. Tacit. Annal. lib. 4.

But perhaps you or some other would willingly have this Question discuss'd, viz. Whether an Injury real, or by Word, or Writing may be offered to a Deceas'd Person, terminating the Injury there, according to the Civil Law of the Romans (as Mr. Wood's Case was, and by which Law Mr. Wood's Book was condemned) so as an Action may be brought by the Heir, or Articles exhibited by way of Indictment by him or any other.

I shall readily give my thoughts upon this Question; provided, what I say is not construed to extend to arraign the Legality of the Sentence against Mr. *Wood*. For I thank God I have learned so much Sense and Manners, as to know that the Determinations of Courts of Judicature ought to be respected and revered; or that a Sentence may be just, tho you or I do not understand it.

To prevent Confusion in the Laws and Cases throughout the Books of the *Civil Law*, which may delude some unwary Persons, I shall *first* acknowledge that a *real* Injury, as opposed to a *verbal* one may be offered to a dead Person, and that it is punishable by way of Articles, if it affects the Heir in *Reputation* or *Inheritance*, and that an Action *then* also shall accrue to the Heir for Recompence; For there the Estate and Reputation of the Heir *himself* is concerned: But if the Injury (for the Propriety of the Word thus applied shall not yet be questioned) *terminates* in the deceased Person only, and is so *pleaded*, without any regard to or for the

the Heir, I cannot find any thing in that Law sufficient to support the Assertion. For *Et si fortè Cadaveri defuncti sit injuria, cui Hæredes, bonorumve Possessores extitimus, Injuriarum NOSTRO nomine habemus Actionem. Spectat enim ad Existimationem nostram* (that is, *Hæredis*) *siqua ei fiat Injuria. IDEMque & si fama ejus cui Hæredes extitimus laceßatur. Dig. Lib. 47. tit. 10 De Injuriis & famosis Libellis.*

And further in the sixth Paragraph, *Quoties autem funeri Testatoris vel cadaveri sit injuria, si quidem post aditam Hæreditatem fiat, dicendum est Hæredi quodammodo factam. Semper enim interest Defuncti Existimationem purgare; quoties autem ante Hæreditatem magis Hæreditati & sic Hæredi per Hæreditatem acquiri. Denique Julianus scribit, si Corpus Testatoris ante aditam Hæreditatem detentum est, acquiri Hæreditati Actiones non esse Dubium.* I say the Injury in these cases follows the Inheritance, and is terminated in the Heir, in the Person living, and upon his account only is the Complaint to be heard. And this seems very reasonable, for if the Estate and Inheritance

is

is given to him, it ought to be his Duty to bury the Testator, to defend his Body, while above-ground, from the Rudeness of Creditors, and from the barbarous usage of any other Persons; and that, according to his quality, a Monument should be erected in his memory, and afterwards preserved by him, &c.

Secondly, I conceive, that a *Verbal* Injury, or Injury by *Word* or *Writing* cannot be offer'd to a deceas'd Person by this Law, terminating the Injury there; so as an Action may be brought by the Heir for it, or that there is any such Crime or Punishment. Lest the contrary may be thought to be inferred from the foregoing Laws, those parts must be explained which seem to look that way. As, *Spectat enim ad Existimationem Hæredis siqua Defuncto fiat injuria. Idemque & si fama ejus, cui Hæredes existimus laessatur*; for there also *spectat ad Existimationem siue famam Hæredis*. I say the Text does not mean that this can be done by *Discourse* or *Writing*. A *real* Injury affecting the Reputation or Estate of the Heir himself is to be understood through-

throughout the whole Law, as appears by the leading and subsequent Expressions in it. The leading instances are, Offering an Injury to the Dead Carcass, whereby an Action does accrue to the Heir in his own name, upon this Account *Spectat ENIM ad exstimationem Heredis*, if an Injury of that Nature is offered to it. The Reason being given upon that Instance, the Discredit coming upon the Heir must be referred to that Act, or to some other *real* Injury that is like it. Then follows, with reference to the Injury offered to the Heir, *ID E Mq; & si fama ejus cui Heredes extitimus, laceffatur*, not by Words or Writing, but by some *Real Act*, as the Gloss upon the Word *laceffatur* intimates, and gives Directions for an Instance to the Institutions in the Title, *Qui & ex quitus causis, Man. par. 1. licet autem*. Where because the General Law of *Ælius Sentius* hinder'd the Manumising of Bond-men if it was in fraud to the Creditors, an Exception is introduced, and Provision is made that a Bond-man shall be made free to act as Heir to the deceased, notwithstanding

standing that the Creditor suffer by his Freedom; and this, as the Text and Gloss declare, lest the Goods and Estate of the deceas'd should otherwise ignominiously be sold by the publick Cryer *sub hasta*; A method among the Antients accounted always scandalous. *Tully pro Pub. Quinctio.*

Remember I said, That the Reputation of the deceased was affected by some such *real Act* as this, in the meaning of the Law, and that it did not include any *Verbal Injury*. But farther it is to be observed, that the above-cited Gloss says, *Ne memoria defuncti* (in that case) *quâdam injuriâ adficiatur*, disowning, that any Injury, properly speaking either *verbal* or *real* in a legal and strict signification of that Word, can be offered to a deceas'd Person. And of this Impropriety *Hottoman* the famous *French Lawyer*, in his Commentaries on this place, takes notice and says, *UTCUNQUE est injuria hic pro contumelia accipitur*, referring himself to such another improper Expression under the Title *De injuriis & famosis libellis*, in the Digest which I repeated at large above, and from

from whence, as I said before, we were referred to this place of the *Institutions*.

Injury therefore in that place of the Digest and Institutions is so called, *quia non fit jure*, as *Ulpian* gives the Etymology in a vulgar and general way, according to the opinion of Commentators, but not in its *legal* Sence, or proper Signification.

This is the result of those Expressions, *Si Fama ejus, sc. Defuncti, lacesatur*, and *Semper enim Hæredis interest Defuncti existimationem purgare*, which if they are considered further than the bare Letter, and the Passages and References of the Gloss compared, the Injury falls only upon the *Living*, and that neither *real non verbal* can properly speaking be offer'd to a deceased Person, terminating the Injury there, without any further consideration. Upon this Exposition, the Definition of Injury and other Laws are intelligible, as *Injuria est Delictum quod ad Contumeliam vel Dolorem alterius admittitur*. The Word *alterius* supposes a Person in *being*, and the Words *Contumelia* and *Dolor* suppose him sensible of it. B *Illud*

Illud relatum peraeque est, eos qui injuriam pati possunt & facere posse, excepting only the Cases of Infants and Madmen. L. illud relatum. Dig. De Injuriis & Fam. Libel.

Injuriarum Actio neque Hæredi, neque in Hæredem datur. L. 13. Dig. de Injuriis.

Est certissima juris regula ex maleficiis pœnales Actiones in Hæredem rei non competere, veluti furti, vi bonorum raptorum, injuriarum, Damni injuria; Sed hæredibus, hujusmodi Actiones competunt nec denegantur, EXCEPTA injuriarum actione, & si qua alia similis inveniat. Inst. Lib. 4. p. 2. non autem omnes. Where Mynsinger upon the same Paragraph, on the Words Exceptâ injuriarum Actione, says, Quod ideo est quia hæc actio non pertinet ad rem familiarem, sed ex merâ vindictâ descendit. What can be plainer !

Homo mortuus non patitur injuriam, says Tuschus in his 389. General Conclusion, quia non potest vulnerari, neque suspendi, neque puniri. The Exceptions to this General Rule are only some particular real Injuries, which affect the Heir, or are punishable by some particular

particular Constitutions, or are esteem-
ed Crimes upon some *Religious* Ac-
counts, or are made so by the *Canon*
Law, viz. Robbing Tombs, a Man
corrupting himself with the dead Car-
cass of a Woman, and the striking
or wounding the dead Body of a
Clergy-man, &c. Tho here I must
confess *Tuschns* and the Author which
he quotes, give a Reason quite contra-
ry to the General Conclusion, viz.
that those Crimes are punishable, be-
cause in those particulars an Injury is
offer'd to the Dead Body. But this
Contradiction is reconcil'd, if in the
Exceptions the Word *Injury* is taken
in its *general* and *loose* Sense as before,
according to its various Significations
repeated in the Digest, or in its *im-*
proper Sense, as *Hottoman* before ob-
served, and not as in the above-men-
tioned General Rule or Conclusion,
according to its *special* Meaning or
Legal Definition. But what if the Ex-
ceptions were to be taken in the same
strict Meaning of the Word as we
have suppos'd it to be in the Conclu-
sion? It confirms the General Rule
in all other Cases, and is far from

maintaining that an Injury by *Word* or *Writing* may be committed. Either way, in the Sense of this Compiler, that Notion is destroyed, and unknown to his laborious Collections.

Hippolytus de Marfiliis, an Author of an established Reputation, in his Commentaries upon the Title of the Digest *De Quæstionibus*, à num. 31. ad num. 65. has collected all the Laws and opinions of the Doctors, in what Instances a Man dead or alive doe agree or disagree, as to the Protection of the Law, or in reference to legal Rights and Consequences. In their *Disagreement*, and that particular Rights once due are alter'd by Death, he has observed and collected twenty four Instances, and proved them by good Authorities. In their *Agreement*, where the Effect of the Law continues after Death, he has found out nine Cases, but not one Word that a dead Person may be defam'd either by *Word* or *Writing*, as undoubtedly he may when *living*, but expressly gives the Law, That *Si Titius est mortuus, non dicitur amplius Titius*, telling his Reader that he would have him

him remember those Instances, for that they will scarce be found so collected in any oth^r Author.

Præterea nec heredibus nec in heredes conceditur injuriarum actio, quia nihil abest ex patrimonio, neque enim in aver-tenda & minuendâ re familiari injuria versatur, sed in solâ contumeliâ, & proinde qui ante litem contestatam moritur, nihil transmittit ad Heredem, quia simul Vindicta extinguitur. Haersolte de Actionibus Civilibus & Criminalibus, in Prolegom. num. 64.

Some Authorities here cited suppose indeed the Deceased to have received the Injury while alive ; but if upon his Death, before Action enter'd or Issue joined in the Cause brought by him while *alive*, no Person *afterwards* (not so much as the Heir) could *continue* that Action, or *raise* a new one in the name of the Deceas'd or in their *own*, either *civiliter* or *criminaliter*, we may be allowed to make a Consequence, that it is not reasonable to suppose that the Law will afford Satisfaction or a Remedy, if an Injury is pretend-ed to be offered him *after* his Decease.

An Action of Injury is a *personal* Action, whether moved *civilly* or *criminally*, and it is a Maxim that such Actions die with the Person: It is extinguished and ceases, both by the Death of the Person giving the Injury, and by the Death of the Person who pretends to have suffer'd. How therefore is it reconcileable, that such an Action should be supported by another, or Articles exhibited in his behalf, for a pretended Injury that commenced against him *after* his Death, of which he is wholly ignorant, and for which his Heir had no Remedy, if the Ancestor had suffered while alive? For that such Actions should die with the Person is a very rational Principle; because perhaps the Sufferer himself might think it prudent to neglect the Injury, or his Interest to overlook and pardon it. Shall therefore a disinterested Person, after his Death, take up the Quarrel and correct such *prudential* Forgiveness?

In this case I wish, Sir, I had your opinion, who are a Civilian by *Office*, and manage Matters with a Skill and Learning

Learning *peculiar* to most of those who preside in the Ecclesiastical Jurisdiction throughout *England*.

It is to be allowed, that in the *Common Laws of England* there is one Precedent contrary to my Interpretations of the Texts of the *Civil Law*; but that Doctrine was never heard of till the Star-Chamber Case, mentioned in the fifth Report, and as I believe never put in practice *since*. It is notorious that the Star-Chamber would make Law, if they could not find any prepared for the purpose. But there is a vast difference between the Star-Chamber Case and the Case of Mr. Wood. John Whitgift the Arch-bishop of Canterbury, the Person traduced, had been just before a Magistrate, a Privy Councillour under the then King, James I, and died under that Government, which had an Interest to support his Reputation. *Comment que le private Homme ou Magistrate soit mort, says the Report, al temps del fessurs del Libel, uncore ceo est punishable, car en l'un Case ceo incite auters de mesme le familie, ou society, a revenge & a infreindre le peace, & en l'autre le Libeller*

traduce & Slander le State & Government, que ne morut pas. A Man therefore at this day by the *Common Law* may be punished for talking scurvily of *Henry VIII.* or of *William the Conqueror*, and the Courtiers and Magistrates under them ; for the Government never dies : and while there remains one of a Family to resent an Injury offer'd to his Ancestor, there is danger, and the Law will lay hold on you for it.

This seems absurd in the general Notion. There ought therefore to be *reasonable* Limitation and Distinction, if it can at any time be the *Common Law*. Otherwise the *former* Ages are under this Protection as well as the *later* ; and the old Fool and Knave with the yesterday's Honest Wise Man : the Antient Disgrace and this day's Honour of Government or Family, stand upon the same Bottom.

But however, neither can this Law govern in the present Case. My Lord Chancellour *Hide* died in Retirement, a Private Person in *France*, before this *present* Reign or the *last* ; out of the protection of the Laws, while living
and

and under a Condemnation to *perpetual* Exile and Banishment. For the truth of this I refer to the 19 Car. II. entitled *An Act for banishing and disenabling the Earl of Clarendon.*

But it is true, Sir, there was *such* a Sentence or something like it as you describe. For how could a poor *Melancholy Monkish Scholar* contend with that powerful and noble Person (who was pleased to appear personally in the Prosecution, and was the greatest Officer next to the Chancellour in the University) in an *inferior* Court, before a modest private Fellow of a College, who signed the Sentence as Judge, at the *Instances* of some worthy Persons, who wisely concluded, it was convenient to pacifie his Lordship.

One would think by the *Gazette* Account of it, and your Description, that his Writings were censur'd in Convocation by the whole University, and that there was the same Formality in the Condemnation as in that of *Herefie*. But, alas, the Book was smother'd in the Theatre-Court, not one Soul, besides an Apparitor, at the *Solemnity*, as I could ever hear of. Notwithstanding

withstanding all this, Mr. Wood carried on his Studies in the University to his dying day, frequented the publick Library, took little or no notice of the *Fire* or *Programma's*, continued his Acquaintance with the Learned Men of that venerable Body, and generously gave by his Will his Printed Books and Manuscripts to the Publick *Museum*; where, and in the Publick Libraries, all his Works, *viz. Antiquitates Oxon. and Athenæ Oxonienses*, in 2 Vol. are deposited as they were first printed, as immortal *Monuments* of his Industry and Learning.

But that he *retained* or gave *Security*, as you insinuate, it is utterly false, for he died in firm persuasion that he had dealt impartially with my Lord Chancellour; tho' great Endeavours were used to convince him of a Mistake, and that his Information coming from angry and disobliged Cavaliers, ought to be suspected.

The Character of the Life of Dr. *Pope*, which is under his own Hand, in the Custody of his Trustees, as I am informed, is certainly *impartial*, and a Master-piece, a very honest and pleasant

pleasant Performance. In which I suppose the *most glorious Action* of the Doctor's Life. about the Contest of *Formalities* is recorded.

' And here I should dismiss Mr. Wood, and close this Chapter, had I not a just Cause of quarrelling with him upon my own account, for having endeavoured to rob me of my deserved Praise, and to obscure the *most Glorious Action* of my Life.

——— *Diripere ausus*

Harentem capiti multâ cum laude Coronam.

' In not mentioning that *famous Contestation*, concerning *Formalities*, which I have described at large in the Fifth Chapter of my being Proctor, but out of ignorance or design, either of which is sufficient to ruin the Credit of an Historian; he has falsified the History, having made the Proctors *Byfield* and *Conant* serve for the Years 1657. and 1658. which is not only notoriously untrue, but also it thrusts my Colleague and my self out of the *Fasti*, or the University Chronicles; which is an intolerable Grievance to Persons thirty

‘ sty of Fame and ambitious of Honour. And this you are pleased to say was of *importance* to his History.

I am of your opinion, that your greatest Praise, and the most glorious Action of your Life was for being concern’d in the famous Contestation about Formalities, and in not giving your consent to alter the Caps in the University. For indeed this Account of Bishop *Ward’s* Life is but a *Trifle* to it, and even to a Person (as you hint your self to be) thirsty of Fame and ambitious of Honour, adds a *less* Credit and Reputation.

But as this Stuff is intolerably vain and fulsom, so it is also false and malicious. Mr. *Wood* had no design to falsifie the History, or to thrust you or your Colleague out of the University Chronicles. It is perfectly a Mistake either in the Printer or Transcriber; for in Mr. *Wood’s* own Book given upon his Death-bed to one of his Nephews, it stands corrected with his Pen, and Dr. *Pope* (that important thing to his History) is inserted in its proper place. But for your further satisfaction, look into the
the

the *Historia & Antiquitates Oxon.* in the *Fasti* for the Year 1658. George Potter and Walter Pope are mention'd to be the Proctors, with this Remark upon the latter, *Potestatem sub finem Anni impetravit Procurator junior profectionem ad exteras gentes instituendi, quare vices absentis implevit* Mr. Tho. Gourney è *Coll. Ænan.* pag. 439.

Mr. Wood has another sort of Character given him by a Reverend and Ingenious Writer, in his *Vindication of the Oxford Historiographer, and his Works*, in page 29. which I shall make bold to transcribe, because I know that it is true, (*viz.*) ‘ He did never in haſt and forwardneſs meddle
‘ with a Subject to which he was not
‘ prepar’d by Education and a due
‘ Method of Studies. He never wrote
‘ to oblige a riſing Party, or to inſi-
‘ nuate into the Diſpoſers of Prefer-
‘ ment, but has been content with his
‘ Station, and aim’d at no End but
‘ Truth. He never took up with the
‘ Transcript of Records where the
‘ Originals might be conſulted, nor
‘ made uſe of others Eyes when his
‘ own could ſerve. He never wrote
‘ in

' in post, with his Body and his
 ' Thoughts in a hurry, but in a fix-
 ' ed Abode and with a deliberate Pen.
 ' He never conceal'd an ungrateful
 ' Truth, nor flourish'd over a weak
 ' place, but in sincerity of meaning
 ' and expression thought an Historian
 ' should be a Man of Conscience.
 ' He never had a Patron to oblige or
 ' forget, and has been a free and in-
 ' dependent Writer. In a word, He
 ' confesses there may be some Mi-
 ' stakes in modern Things and Per-
 ' sons; when he could have no evi-
 ' dence but from the information of
 ' living Friends, or perhaps Enemies,
 ' but he is confident, that where Re-
 ' cords are cited, and where authen-
 ' tick Evidence could possibly be had,
 ' there he has been punctual and ex-
 ' act. He may further confess, that
 the Stile of the Author is rugged and
 inartificial, almost as flat as your own;
 But without your Quibbles and te-
 dious Digressions which have no con-
 nexion with the principal Subject.

Had he had a Skill to have given
 an Air to his Narrations, his Books
 had been more diverting; but he de-
 sign'd

sign'd them for nothing else but a *Record* or *Registry*.

This, Doctor, contains Matter of good instruction to you and others. From hence you may learn not to meddle with a Subject to which you are not prepared by Education and Study. Some Men travel and converse, that they may be qualified to tell a Story or crack a Jest over a Bottle, and to make such Sport as you were pleas'd to divert your self with, when you took the *chearful Cup in the Barn near Rochelle, as you were making your grand Tour of France*, or to come home furnished with Abilities to compose a *Salisbury Canto*, a *Catch*, or a *Ballad*; But if this was also your Design, you must not meddle with any thing that requires *Thinking* and *Judgment*. If you do, we ought to accost you in those *proper* Expressions which you say the Vice-Chancellor did in full Convocation, *viz. Egregie Procurator Tace*.

Hence also you may conclude, that all Men are not of your opinion, that the Credit of an Historian is ruined, because he is guilty of some Defects
and

and Escapes. Many things in Mr. *Wood's* Writings ought to be lopt off, and many things will bear an Enlargement, yet I cannot but admire the vastness of his Design, the Curiosity and Usefulness of his Performance. We are contented that he himself should be censured where really defective. Deal with him as he has dealt with others, yet his Friends will not be under any apprehension that they shall be depriv'd of the Honour of his Reputation.

My Lord Chancellor *Hyde* was most certainly a brave, a loyal, and a wise but unfortunate States-man. His Country, I mean the more knowing part, will always mention him with Gratitude and Honour ; But that he had *all* the Virtues of a perfect Hero, it is ridiculous to pretend to allow it.

Bishop *Ward* was a noted Mathematician and Astronomer, a good Divine, a profound Reasoner, of an affable, courtly, Gentleman-like temper, a publick Spirit, and a good Friend. But before he was advanced to the Episcopal See, he was suspected to waver in his Opinions about Government

Government, and his good Nature formerly betrayed him into some Irregularities ; infomuch that I cannot see the necessity why he should be set in the Calendar for a Saint, or canonized. But for all that, to the Honour of the Church of *England* ; I wish all his Successors may deserve as good a Character , and have a better Historian.

Had the modern Biographers been as just and sincere as the Author of *Athene Oxonienses*, without Flourishes and Concealments , their Pieces had not been thrown aside with Dissatisfaction, as Panegyric, inimitable, and Romantick.

Quintus Curtius, (says one) deserves Praise for being *sincere*. He says what is good and bad in *Alexander*, and never suffers the Merit of his Hero to prevent him. Whereas *Eusebius* shews nothing in *Constantine* but what is commendable ; who nevertheless had great Failings. We may expose their *chief* Faults *faithfully*, but not *irreverently*. It is a fault in *Platina* to treat the Popes in such a manner. Perhaps my Friend too

C

upon

upon this account may deserve sometimes to be corrected. All that I contend for, is, that the Biographers ought to set down the *chief* Vertues and Vices of those they represent. Every Historian of repute does relate the Defects of those they write of. The sacred History shews us Instances of the basest Villany in the best Examples. Much rather should a Biographer (whom we cannot properly call an Historian) describe his Subject in its due proportion, being supposed, whilst he is writing, to have his Eyes and his Thoughts contracted only to that narrow compass. Bishop Burnet says, in his Preface to the Life of Sir *Matt hew Hale*, to this purpose,

‘ That since all Men have their blind
 ‘ Sides, and commit Errors, he that
 ‘ will industriously lay these together,
 ‘ leaving out, or but slightly touching
 ‘ what should be set against them
 ‘ to balance them, may make a very
 ‘ good Man appear in bad Colours.
 ‘ So upon the whole matter, there is
 ‘ not that reason to expect either much
 ‘ Truth or great Instruction from
 ‘ what is written concerning Hero’s or
 Princes ;

‘ Princes ; for few have been able to
 ‘ imitate the Patterns *Suetonius* set the
 ‘ World, in writing the Lives of the
 ‘ *Roman* Emperours with the same Free-
 ‘ dom that they had led them.

In God’s Name therefore let there
 be no such Prevarication in Writing
 Lives of *private* Persons, as there is
 no Necessity and little Temptation
 for it.

Diogenes Laertius, tho dry and je-
 june, is very plain and faithful. He
 tells us that *Socrates* Wife would scold
 and throw Water upon him, and that
 he himself would endure a Beating.

Plutarch says that the brave *Cato*
Uticensis was a *fudling* Fellow and a
Cuckold. That *Alcibiades* lisp’d, or,
 as one of his Translators renders it,
 that his Tongue was something *fat* ;
 that he gave a School-Master a Box
 under the Ear because he would not
 lend him a *Homer* ; that he had a very
 large Dog, and that the *Athenians*
 mightily blam’d him for cutting off his
 Tail, which occasioned this ingenious
 Reply, *That he did it to divert them*
from saying worse things of himself ; that
 he was a Promise-breaker, perjur’d,

and that he got King *Agis's* Wife with child, &c. *lut. in vitâ Alcib.*

Suppose *Plutarch's* Works had been censur'd because he could not have brought two Witnesses that would have sworn all this to be true? Do you think it would have ruin'd the Credit of the Historian?

In short, *Cornelius Nepos*, a Latin, followed the same Method in writing of his Lives, and makes the same *Alcibiades* an extraordinary Man and a very naughty Spark.

Had Mr. *Wood* defer'd the Publication of his last Volume for twenty or thirty years, the Book had found more Friends; but there is a Simplicity and an honest Design which runs through the whole that will for ever support it, were it guilty of all those Errors which you or your *Fellow-Sufferers* have been pleased to charge it with.

The Summ of what I object is, That you have grossly abused Bishop *Ward* and Mr. *Wood*, for which all good and learned Men call loudly for Satisfaction. And tho perhaps I might have drawn up your Indictment in a
more

more solemn manner, I found it difficult to put on a serious countenance to confute your Jest, or something absurd to answer your Merriments with a *Syllogism*. If you are incorrigible, I concur in your W I S H, that you may have leave *to depart in peace*, for otherwise there will be little or no occasion of you in this World.

I am, Sir,

London, July 1.
1697.

Tours at command.

F I N I S.